

**BUDGET COMMITTEE
of the
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Budget Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislative Building, Veterans Highway, Smithtown, New York, on Monday, **March 24, 2003**.

Members Present:

Legislator Martin Haley - Chairman
Legislator David Bishop - Vice-Chairman
Legislator William Lindsay
Legislator Fred Towle

Also In Attendance:

Paul Sabatino II - Counsel to the Legislature
Ken Knappe - County Exec's Budget Office
Fred Pollert - Director, Budget Review Office
Jim Spero - Deputy Director of the Budget Review Office
Bill Faulk - County Exec's Office
Lance Reinheimer - Budget Review Office
Kim Laube - HUGS
All other interested parties

Minutes Taken By:

Donna Catalano - Court Stenographer

1

(*THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 11:32 A.M.*)

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Before it's afternoon, we'll start. Please rise for the Pledge.

SALUTATION

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Thank you. Okay. I have one card. Kim. Is that Laub or Laube?

MS. LAUBE:

Laube.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Kim wants to speak about HUGS, IR 1116.

MS. LAUBE:

Just once again, I don't want to take up too much of your time. Fortunate enough for me, I absolutely love what I do. My energy and passion for my program is boundless. Without the restoration of the it funding, it is most likely we will have to close this program after 23 years. Again, we made such an impact in the youth that are involved with us and in the ripple effect of the other youth that they

-- that they work with and, in fact, in the lives that they can touch as well. So I just wanted to present today and just let you know that I'm here. I think this is important and hope to gain some support from you as well. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Thank you very much. Kim, so you know, Legislator Postal has asked that we table that again. And I think that -- I think one of the difficulties is that you are attached to -- there's other components of that legislation I think that they -- somebody's looking to modify.

MS. LAUBE:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Anyone else? Fred, Jim, do you have anything.

MR. POLLERT:

Yeah. Since the committee has last met, there has been a revision or proposed revision by New York State to the Pension Bills. The State Comptroller has announced that he intends to charge at 4.5 percent of the base salary rates that were reported. There will be a substantial improvement in both the Budget Review Office as well as the budget model as a result of that. However, in 2004, the costs will continue to increase over the 2003 adopted amounts by approximately 62 to \$65 million. However, there will not be an immediate shortfall in 2003. There should, in fact, a small surplus in that account, because we had actually budget more than the 4.5% increase.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Fred, from my understanding of the article that I read about the Comptroller's plan, it will call for an stead allotment from every -- it won't bounce at all as far as the stock market is concerned, which,

2

I mean, would have to help in our budgeting process, am I correct?

MR. POLLERT:

The plan as we understand it will definitely help us in 2003. He is proposing that there be a minimum four and a half percent contribution rate versus having it bounce around. So if the stock market does extremely well, you will continue to make the four and a half percent contribution rate, but if the Russell 3000 does not recover, we are projecting that there will be a rate increase for 2004. Lance is really the expert on it so I'm going to defer.

LEG. LINDSAY:

See I -- maybe I misread the article. I thought the contribution rate would be a flat 4.5 that would go up with certainly a percentage of what salaries are, but I didn't realize that that was a flow and that it could raise. So that -- I'm sorry.

MR. REINHEIMER:

No. That's correct. Fred is correct that it will be contingent upon the return on investments on, that 4.5 is the minimum payment that we will be -- that all employers would pay and that it would go up from that depending on return on investments. And that this year they're going back to the 4.5% as a base, but they have to make up for the shortfall that happened this year. So we anticipate that it will be based on what the state had published in February, which was an 11% contribution rate for the ERS.

LEG. LINDSAY:

The other thing in the article, although as the sole trustee he has the ability to put in this plan, I noticed that he was looking for Legislative approval of it so. It's still, I guess, could be modified, am I right in assuming that?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yes, that's correct. Another major change that helps everybody in budgeting is that the rates that the state will post for employer contributions will be set as of the value of the funds on April 1st. In the past, it was based on the value of the fund on March 31st. And what means is that the rates, when they give us the rates during the budget adoption proceeds in August, those are going to be the rates that we actually end up paying the following December. And that helps us with budgeting, and it helps the guesstimate, because what the state has done in the past is they have changed the contribution rate after budgets were adopted. And in the past when we had surpluses because of excellent return on investments, it's been a benefit to the municipalities. And this, of course, the contrary, it's been a -- you know, it would have been a disaster. So it helps us with budgeting, it helps us more accurately project what our expenses will be rather than bouncing around.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

But that only -- that only accounts for some bouncing, and it resolves an issue for 2003. But it doesn't resolve our longer term issue.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Correct. This past year with the poor return on the investments, we

3

will have to make this up. The -- New York State is one of the best funded retirement systems, and they aren't go to underfund it in the future. So this year technically it's going to be underfunded, but they're going to make that up in subsequent years.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

They do that via some bonding or something? I mean, I think what they are trying -- would like to do even out the highs and lows so that we don't have those problems. But in the long run, it could mean that we typically would pay a little bit more than normal. So instead of, you know, instead of getting major decreases, you know, we went through a number of years doing where things were doing very well and we almost had to give no contribution. They'll keep that at some level so that we can deal with it in the future. Is there any plan to do that?

MR. REINHEIMER:

It's -- they're going to fund it fully -- they're going to fully fund it. And generally, the state doesn't give us anything for nothing. So any employer contributions that are due this year that we don't make, I'm sure the state will include a provision for interest on their past history long term rate of return, which is around 8.5%. So any deferred employer contributions for this year, I'm sure future rates will include a component that will make up for return.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

That's an interesting point. So let's say he was going to cap it for 2003 at 4.5%, but it should have been an 11%, then you're saying that we should have some sort of surplus perhaps in that area. Seems to me that it should be an option on our part, especially in light that they are going to charge us interest, right? In other words, if we -- follow me?

MR. POLLERT:

The problem with New York State Pension is that you can't prepay any of the expenses, you can't -- even if we have a surplus, you can't provide the funds to the State of New York. So if you overpay, they say thank you very much. If you underpay, they charge you 8.5% or they charge you a large premium. So what we're currently estimating is that across all funds, we should have a surplus of \$10.8 million this year. But we will have a shortfall of approximately \$66.8 million next year, because everything is going to just roll out one year. What they've done is they've taken 2003 and rolled it out to 2004.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Is the State Pension Fund fully funded?

MR. REINHEIMER:

I really can't say at this point. I don't know. They base their funding on actuarial projections, and I know from information I've read in the past, they try to fund it as fully as its --

LEG. LINDSAY:

My point is it's rare to find a pension fund that's fully funded?

4

MR. REINHEIMER:

New York State is one of the best funded. There are many State Pension Funds that are under funded that have problems, and New York State, you know, they won't suffer this year. People will still get their retirements checks on time. They are not going to run into any shortfall in cash.

LEG. LINDSAY:

No. What I meant by fully funded is that everybody in the system, the money is in reserves to pay them out if the whole thing went defunct tomorrow.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Right. Future liabilities, right. They are funded for reserves for future liabilities based on enrollment.

LEG. LINDSAY:

The other plan that was being kicked around that I think is being sponsored by the Governor is to stretch out the payments other five years. Would that help us more than the Comptroller plan?

MR. POLLERT:

No. The two plans are fairly consistent with respect to trying to giving us budget certainty. The long term proposal of the Governor, I believe, may cost more than the proposal of the Comptroller's Office, because the Comptroller is just looking in at the 4.5% increase. The Governor wanted to use what the published rates were and then bomb out and smooth out what the future year increases are. So at this point in time because the Comptroller's plan generates a \$10 million surplus, it appear that the Comptroller's plan is more advantageous than the Governor's plan.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

We have a blip coming up next year, 60 million, I mean, just a one shot deal. Why would you not, especially with rates -- depending on what the rates would be, with the rates being so low --

MR. REINHEIMER:

We don't know if next year is a one shot. It depends on future returns on investments for the retirement fund and what their actuaries determine needs to be.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

So what you're saying is that's not -- the Governor's proposal -- I think Fred's comment was only as it relates to 2003.

MR. POLLERT:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

I understand. Thank you. We're going to go to the agenda. Legislator Bishop is on his way, but he'll be a while.

5

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

2017-02. Amending the 2003 Operating Budget Transferring funds for the installation of flagpoles at various health centers, the purchase of mobile data terminals for the Sheriff's Civil Division and replacement of personal computers for Legislative District Offices. (TOWLE)

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

All the resolution are tabled from last meeting. The first one is 2017. Legislator Towle.

LEG. TOWLE:

It's three items, Legislator Haley. I'm going to make a motion to approve this resolution. It was done this way, obviously because my office did not meet the deadline on the mobile data terminals, both the other two items are just as important. One is computers for our district offices. As I've talked to most the Legislators, our hardware and soft ware in most instances is five or six years old. Legislator Postal has moved to upgrade our offices with two new computers, but obviously many of us have more terminals than that. Four appears to be the adequate number for everybody. And I had received complaints from some of the folks at the health centers in reference to the fact that they did not have any way to display the American Flag. That complaint was actually last year. So the bill had been filed to do that. So we tried to roll all three of these items into one resolution. Obviously the mobile data terminal is for the Deputy Sheriff's Department, which is a continuation of a program that we already started and need now to complete.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Okay. And for the record, this is --

LEG. TOWLE:

\$273,600 in total.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

273,000 coming out of pay-as-you-go?

LEG. TOWLE:

I'd refer to BRO, but that is my recollection. We've moved it around now a couple of times to try to accommodate everybody.

MR. SABATINO:

There's two different offsets. The flags and the mobile data units

for the Sheriff's Office, that total is up to 225,000, that's coming from the pay-as-you-go. The 48,000 which is for the computer upgrades is coming from the Legislature's 456 account.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Did we say something wrong? Fred left.

MR. SPERO:

No. We just needed another book of resolutions.

6

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Budget Review have any comments? You don't have a problem with that \$48,600?

MR. SPERO:

From a technical point of view, the resolution is good.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Motion by Legislator Towle, seconded by myself. All in favor?
Opposed? 2017 is APPROVED. (VOTE: 4-0-0-0)

2255-02. To transfer surplus funds to County Tax Stabilization Reserve fund. (ALDEN)

LEG. TOWLE:

Just a quick explanation.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Did you want to do that, Jim or Counsel?

MR. SABATINO:

This is an extension of that discussion we had at the last committee meeting. Last year, there had been two stand alone budget amendments that together were going to take at the time was thought to be \$670,000, and it was going to use a portion for the -- that tuition program for FRES and the balance was going to into tax stabilization. However, the amendment got vetoed because there was in the intervening period of time a new calculation which showed the total was 270,000. So at the last Legislative meeting you took 50,000 out of the new number of 270 and you allocated it for that FRES Tuition Reimbursement Program. That leaves a remainder of 220,000, which this legislation proposes to put into tax stabilization reserve. So the discussion at the committee meeting was maybe you wanted to hold on to that for offsets because it was a real dollar amount. And that's why it was tabled. This one was tabled, but the companion bill was approved. So that just gives you the structures of the framework of the discussion that took place.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I have a question.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Really for Budget Review, is it -- is it wise at this time to move more money into tax stabilization being our fiscal shape for the year?

MR. POLLERT:

You can always transfer funds into the Tax Stabilization Reserve Account. At this point in time, there is a tremendous amount of

uncertainty with respect to what's going to be going on with the New York State Operating Budget. The County Executive's Budget Office has forecasts that there will be nearly a \$20 million hit during 2003 with respect to the New York State Operating Budget. It would be nice to know where we were going with that prior to transferring funds into

7

tax stabilization reserve. Once you put it in, it becomes rather difficult to get the funds out. As Legislative Counsel can tell you, you can move it out for unanticipated expenses, but I'm not sure whether or not the New York State Budget passing down higher costs to the County would be unanticipated cost or not under the retirements of the state law.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I make a motion to table.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Second. All in favor? Opposed? 2255 is TABLED. (VOTE: 4-0-0-0)

1105-03. Amending the adopted 2003 Operating Budget and transferring funds in connection with transfer of Red Cross Alternatives to Incarceration Program from County Department of Probation to County Sheriff's Office. (BISHOP)

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Let's pass over that for a moment.

LEG. TOWLE:

I was going to make a motion to table subject to call. The Sheriff's Office has indicated that, you know, publically on the record and so has Probation that they'd like to leave things the way they are.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Motion to table subject to call. Second by Legislator Lindsay. All in favor? Opposed? 1105 is TABLED SUBJECT TO CALL (VOTE: 4-0-0-0)

1115-03. Amending the 2003 Operating Budget transferring funds for the Vocational Education and Extension Board. (CARACAPPA)

LEG. TOWLE:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

We have a corrected copy. Correction, Counsel. It seems to me it's 400,000 and the offset is the Capital Fund.

MR. SABATINO:

That's my recollection, but I just want to double check, because that's gone through a few different --

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

That's the latest copy I have.

LEG. TOWLE:

Legislator Haley, as they are looking the bill up, just for the purpose of the record, this was debated, as Legislator Lindsay knows, at extent at Public Safety. It's in reference to training time and available time that's provided to our Fire Departments at the vocational facilities --

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

I'm more concerned about the offset.

8

LEG. TOWLE:

-- in Yaphank. Just for the purpose of the record so that we just didn't approve \$400,000 expenditure without even thinking about it. What this will do is restore the hours available to the Fire Departments for the purpose of training.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Motion by Legislator Towle, seconded by Legislator Lindsay. All in favor? Opposed? 1115 is APPROVED. (VOTE: 4-0-0-0)

LEG. TOWLE:

Co sponsor as well on that bill.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Co sponsor for Legislator Towle, Legislator Haley, anyone else?

LEG. LINDSAY:

I'm on it already.

1116-03. Amending the 2003 Operating Budget transferring funds to the Suffolk Y Jewish Community Inc. (POSTAL)

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

I have a request from Legislator Postal to table 1116. I'll make that motion, seconded by Legislator Lindsay. All in favor? Opposed? TABLED (VOTE: 4-0-0-0)

1118-03. Amending the 2003 Operating Budget to appropriate funds for the contract agency, Parents for Megan's Law. (CARACAPPA)

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

I don't know of any corrected copy.

MR. SABATINO:

There is a corrected copy from March 3rd, which changed -- which changed the offset from FICA to the Capital Fund.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

This is only \$22,759. Is this an appropriate offset? What are we doing for Parents for Megan's Law? Jim or Fred.

MR. SPERO:

I can't comment on the necessity for the money that's being transferred. This is a Legislative request. We could change the offset if the sponsor -- to retirements system, there will be some extra money in that account.

LEG. TOWLE:

Is the offset fine? Is there a problem with the offset?

MR. SPERO:

The question is you want to use pay-as-you-go money for this -- for this kind of a purpose? If not, we could change the offset.

MR. SABATINO:

Legally, it's a legitimate offset. There is a policy question, which

9

I think the Chairman is raising which is since you only put 900, or I think it was \$911,000 into pay-as-you-go the, concept being pay-as-you-go was to, you know, replace those kinds of items that normally can have a long term life. Do you want to not tap into that offset and have it available for other projects that come down the road? But the nature of an offset is if you wipe out an offset, it's not available. So it's legal to wipe out the offset. It's a policy question as to where you want to go with it.

(LEGISLATOR BISHOP ARRIVED AT 11:55 A.M.)

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Okay. Motion by Legislator Towle, seconded by myself. All in favor? Opposed? 1118 is APPROVED. (VOTE: 4-0-0-0)

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Legislator Bishop, for your information, 1105 we've tabled subject to call. I understand they've worked that out. You want the record to reflect the majority?

LEG. BISHOP:

No, not yet.

1146-03. Implementing operating agreement between the County of Suffolk and the Suffolk County Campaign Finance Board. (POSTAL)

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

1146, it's also been requested by the Presiding Officer to table. I'll make that motion, seconded by Legislator Towle. All in favor? Opposed? 1146 is TABLED. (VOTE: 4-0-0-0)

1157-03. Amending the 2003 Operating budget and transferring funds in connection with transfer of police garage functions. (POSTAL)

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

We have a corrected copy.

MR. SABATINO:

The most recent corrected copy takes into account some suggestions, technical suggestions, that were recommended by Public Works and then reviewed by the Legislative Office of Budget Review to make sure they were appropriate. Ans basically, it was an adjustment on the appropriation account, and now it's technically proficient from the standpoint of the department as well as Budget Review.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Any questions? Budget Office? Budget Office, you have a comment 1157.

MR. KNAPPE:

The only thing I want to bring out on as far as IR 1157, I do not know if the Department of Public Works is endorsing the bill. I think they would just bring it out in front of the committee some of the technical deficiencies in the bill.

10

MR. SABATINO:

Correct. I didn't mean to imply, I tried to use the word technical. They simply said if it's going to happen, the dollar amount has to be correct and the positions had to be reconfigured, and that's what was done. But it was not intended to be an endorsement.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I'm going to make a motion that we table that until we can took into that in Public Works a little bit more.

LEG. TOWLE:

I'll second.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Motion to table and a second.

LEG. BISHOP:

Opposed.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

All in favor? Opposed? 1157 is TABLED (VOTE: 3-1-0-0) (Opposed; Leg. Bishop)

Let it reflect Legislator Bishop voted in opposition. Actually that's it with the agenda. However, Legislator Foley has amended his 1145, his resolution, which was tabled subject to call and asked that in consideration that someone on this committee consider that resolution.

LEG. BISHOP:

Please add me to the majority on the resolutions I was not present for. And I apologize to the committee, I confused as to the starting time.

LEG. TOWLE:

Motion to put with the majority.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

We have a motion and a second to include Legislator Bishop with the majority vote. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. TOWLE:

You cannot amendment a vote -- we'll ask Counsel. You can't amend a vote that was already taken that you weren't here unless we make a motion to reconsider the vote.

MR. SABATINO:

Technically it's a motion to reconsider and then --

LEG. TOWLE:

Exactly.

11

TABLED SUBJECT TO CALL

1145-03. To transfer surplus health plan funds for restoration of cuts for Patient Care Services in County Health Department. (FOLEY)

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

We're done. I have no inclination at this juncture to do anything with 1145.

LEG. TOWLE:

What was his change, Legislator Haley?

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

I'm not sure. I'm not sure what the specific change was. We tabled it subject to call last week. I'm going to find out what its affect is.

MR. SABATINO:

It was tabled subject to call because it was a companion bill to another initiative that actually did get adopted at the meeting. So using that as a vehicle for other items the, overlap duplicative -- not overlap, but the duplicative portion was modified and replaced with a \$4000 allocation from the Legislature's contingency account to fund the Suffolk County Interagency Community Council at 2000; the Nassau-Suffolk Network at 2000; then another \$2500 was taken from pay-as-you-go account to allocate money to St. Mary's School in East Islip for the purchase of the defibrillators. And that's the essence of the new bill.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

I just have a question on --

LEG. BISHOP:

We buy defibrillators for private schools?

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

It was either that -- or actually, I have a charter school that I want to get some defibrillators for.

LEG. TOWLE:

Mr. Chairman, can I ask you question on another bill?

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Go ahead.

LEG. LINDSAY:

What did we do with 45?

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Well, right now it's tabled to subject to call. But I have a question on this. What is the Nassau-Suffolk Network? Does anybody know what that is? Counsel?

MR. SABATINO:

I'm not personally familiar with their work.

12

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Anybody have any interest?

LEG. LINDSAY:

I have a few more questions. Budget Review, is the offset in order?

MR. SPERO:

Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:

\$6500. And the \$2500 was for a defibrillator for --

MR. SABATINO:

It's for St. Mary's School in East Islip. The money would be used for the purchase of defibrillators.

LEG. LINDSAY:

And it's appropriate that we do that?

MR. SABATINO:

It's legal. Again, it's a policy issue. It's legal, it's permissible, but the policy issue is where do you go in terms of other entities.

LEG. BISHOP:

So what's the policy that makes it legal? We can purchase defibrillators for any organization?

MR. SABATINO:

It's two separate issues. The purchase of defibrillators, because it's public health, public safety goal or objective is a legitimate expenditure of funds. But different issue as to whether or not you want to undertake on a voluntary basis --

LEG. BISHOP:

I want to know what the legal --

MR. SABATINO:

Simple. It's legally permissible to allocate the \$2500.

LEG. LINDSAY:

And what is the \$7 in the first resolve? What does that mean ,a dollar, a dollar, a dollar?

MR. SABATINO:

Okay. What happened there was because the Legislator didn't want to wait for the next cycle of doing budget amendments this has happened on several case now -- Legislators are using other bills that aren't going anywhere because something else has been done to accomplish the goal to become the vehicle. However, you need -- you need to have the underlying original purpose to be part of the bill. So what happened was the two -- the \$2.9 million appropriation was reduced to \$7.

LEG. BISHOP:

I have a --

13

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Legislator Foley is here. After Legislator Bishop speaks, then Legislator Foley can discuss this slight of hand that we seem to be --

LEG. FOLEY:

It's not a slight of hand, what it is --

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

No. No. No. Legislator Bishop first.

LEG. BISHOP:

I just want to go back to Counsel and get a clarification. So defibrillators can be purchased for anybody, anywhere by the County because it promotes our public health, public safety mandate?

MR. SABATINO:

Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:

Okay. So no matter what the organization is we may purchase. All right. I just wanted to know.

MR. SABATINO:

As long as it's not a terrorists organization that's been --

LEG. BISHOP:

What's the prohibition on terrorists besides wisdom?

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Legislator Foley, before you start, could you tell me who the Nassau-Suffolk Neighborhood Network is.

LEG. FOLEY:

Nassau-Suffolk Neighborhood Network is -- is a grass roots, not-for-profit agency that has advocated for a number of good government and community -- community, let's say interested programs and policies. The utilization of our member item monies have been -- been a number of not-for-profit that we have allocated dollars to, and this is in keeping with that tradition, if you will, of over the years allocating dollars for organizations that are looking after and advocate for the communities --

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Are these monies that typically have been allocated to each Legislator?

LEG. FOLEY:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Oh, I'm sorry.

LEG. FOLEY:

Correct. That's correct. That's correct.

14

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

I have nothing else. Anyone else?

LEG. BISHOP:

No. Motion to approve.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Explain the \$7.

LEG. FOLEY:

The reason for the \$7 -- when I had spoken with James Spero -- he could have given the answer prior to my arrival here.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

He is being very cautious.

LEG. FOLEY:

But the fact is from what was told, we had to at least technically adhere to the spirit of budget amendments. And since the budget amendment was originally for health centers, we still had to carry that through even in the amended version. So since we took care of health centers in another resolution, but since I couldn't completely -- complete change to reso, we had to technically adhere to allocating a minimal amount of dollars to the health center area in order to make the other changes to the bill -- let's say to make other changes to the bill and allow them to be voted on today. That's the way it was explained to me.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:
Motion by Legislator Bishop, seconded by Legislator Lindsay.
Legislator Bishop -- Legislator Bishop has a question of Counsel.

LEG. BISHOP:
Not on this resolution but --

CHAIRMAN HALEY:
All right. Let's vote this resolution. All in favor? Opposed? 1145
is APPROVED. (VOTE:4-0-0-0)

LEG. BISHOP:
Before we adjourn, the reason I want to ask it on the record is I think other Legislators may benefit from the question as well. I know that last year there was a Capital -- or I believe it to be true that there was a Capital line for defibrillators; is that correct? Does anybody know?

MR. SPERO:
We've passed several budget amendments for the capital -- to appropriate Capital Funds for purchase of defibrillators, but when we adopt the Capital Budget, we have not put money into a project for those -- for that purpose. So we have to keep transferring money to -- to but additional defibrillators.

15

LEG. LINDSAY:
But isn't that for County facilities?

MR. SPERO:
Previous ones, yes.

LEG. BISHOP:
When I think of my own district, the only County facility where people congregate is a golf course, but I have three large public beaches that our town owns. Now, if it's a County policy to promote public health and public safety by providing defibrillators to institutions and locations where people congregate, can I use that Capital Account to purchase defibrillators for that purpose?

MR. SABATINO:
If we had a capital account, but we don't.

LEG. BISHOP:
So now I'm confused as to what happened last year. Didn't we --

MR. SABATINO:
Just go back in history. I think I know where you're coming from. If you recall, it was this Budget Committee that first addressed the issue of defibrillators two years ago. In fact, the first proposal that came up, if you remember, was a large sum of money. The committee -- the committee just for policy reasons, not for legal reasons, said you don't want to do that kind of brand new initiative in the middle of the year, plus concerns were raised about how far do you go. So it wasn't done. It wasn't done in the Capital Budget either.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:
Ken.

MR. KNAPPE:

Well, one issue as far as Capital Programs go with defibrillators and the giving of them to other municipalities or to other function if they are bonded, I do believe that the County has to retain ownership of those bondable items. They cannot be given to a town or to a public school.

LEG. BISHOP:

But they can be given to the police precinct.

LEG. TOWLE:

The \$2500 units, you can give a grant if you would like to the ABC School District or the blah, blah, blah organization to go out and buy

--

LEG. BISHOP:

That's an Operating Budget grant.

LEG. TOWLE:

-- to go out and but a defibrillator. You wouldn't use Capital Program money to start with, because they are \$2500 units, unless, you know, you are giving an enormous amount of units to an organization.

16

We passed an few resolutions in reference to installing defibrillators at Counties facilities. We did it for the Park Police, for example. We did it for, I think, Probation. The Police we had done it years ago, they finally just finished that up. But if you wanted to do for a private facility, you would have to take it out of your member item money or get Legislators to agree to take it out of other money.

LEG. BISHOP:

That's what I'm trying to get at. So there's distinction between an Operating Budget defibrillator and Capital Budget Defibrillator. And I know there were project lines in the Capital Budget for defibrillators, but what you are telling me is they are not funded; is that correct?

MR. SABATINO:

That's my memory, but I'll defer to the --

MR. SPERO:

There's no funding in the adopted Capital Budget for the purchase of the defibrillators. We have to amend the budget to move money from other areas.

LEG. LINDSAY:

And the member item money is given to the organization, and they purchase it themselves.

LEG. BISHOP:

I understand that. I just -- I seem to recall, and perhaps I'm wrong, that there was a Capital line for defibrillators as well. But thank you. I appreciate the discussion.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:

Considering defibrillators have a useful life of more than a year, there's a point at which -- or maybe could be even more than five years, that you can capitalize those. But the other policy question you have is, you know, how much are you going to do for other municipalities? I have typically not supported that. They have

taxing entities, and they have the ability to tax the people in their particular jurisdiction to buy defibrillators.

LEG. TOWLE:
Just on another resolution.

CHAIRMAN HALEY:
Let me finish. Let Ken finish up.

MR. KNAPPE:
I apologize. If you want me to defer this until after Legislator Towle speaks, just basically, I wanted to make a general comment on the pay-as-you-go funding. There has been about approximately 900,000 that was adopted. I don't have the exact figures in front of me. We are down to less than 200,000 left in that appropriation after -- if all the actions that were taken in front of this committee carry through on April 8th, we are left with less for \$200,000 for the remainder of the year for those types of programs. I just wanted to go on the record and report that.

17

CHAIRMAN HALEY:
That's good to know. Legislator Towle.

LEG. TOWLE:
I wanted to refer to your bill for the Police Athletic League. What was the amount on that? I know it's tabled subject to call, but I --

CHAIRMAN HALEY:
That actually goes back to last year, so it really shouldn't even be on the agenda. That was -- that was looking to, I think it was about 50,000 or something like that. But that's --

LEG. TOWLE:
The offset is still --

CHAIRMAN HALEY:
No, it wouldn't be, because technically -- it sits on the agenda because it's the offset is based on 2002, it's not a 2003 offset. It really shouldn't be. It's moved, it's not legal. Thanks. Anything else? We're adjourned.

(*THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 12:10 P.M.*)

{ } DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY

18